



Kosovo Educational Research Journal

Volume 4, Issue 1, 21-42.

ISSN: 2710-0871

<https://kerjournal.com/>

The Relationship Between Conflict Action Styles and Organizational Commitment Perceptions of Academic Staff in Vocational Schools

Arzuhan ÇAKIR¹

Mehmet ULUTAŞ²

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to determine whether the conflict management strategies used by academic staff influence organizational commitment and whether they differ according to independent variables. In this study, a relational screening model, one of the research methods, was used. The accessible population of the research consists of 106 academic staff working in Vocational Schools of Aydın Adnan Menderes University. In the research conducted in the 2018-2019 academic year, Conflict Action Styles Inventory and Organizational Commitment Scale were used as data collection tools. Statistical analyses were performed with IBM SPSS 25.0 program. Descriptive statistics were expressed as frequency (f), percentage (%), mean (\bar{X}), standard deviation (SD), minimum and maximum values. In the study, firstly, whether the scales fit the normal distribution hypothesis was determined by skewness and kurtosis coefficients and parametric test methods were preferred. The gender, age, marital status, education, academic title, and term of office distribution of the academic staff included in the study were examined and it was observed with the regression model created in line with the determined purpose conflict action styles predict organizational commitment positively and statistically significant. Moreover, when other variables are held constant, a one-unit increase in the level of conflict action styles of academic staff provides an increase of 0.183 in the level of organizational commitment. Conflict action styles of academic staff should be studied with different groups at the point of organizational commitment, opportunities should be given for employees to improve themselves and rise in other institutions, and the importance of creating organizational commitment should be known by taking opinions not only from academicians but also from other professions, and studies related to conflict styles and organizational commitment should be conducted at various times.

Keywords: Educational administration, Conflict action styles, Organizational commitment, Academic staff, Vocational schools

To cite this article: Çakır, A. & Ulutaş, M. (2023). The Relationship Between Conflict Action Styles and Organizational Commitment Perceptions of Academic Staff in Vocational Schools. Kosovo Educational Research Journal, 4(1), 21-42

Introduction

¹ Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi

² Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, mehmet.ulutas@adu.edu.tr.

Today, the issue of conflict is intensively studied by psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, education, and management sciences. Since the issue of conflict is examined from different points of view by researchers, it is difficult to declare a common statement on this issue. In the studies conducted by researchers on conflict management, conflict is briefly defined as the sharing of scarce resources or the allocation of activities between two or more individuals or groups in the organization and the disagreement or dispute arising from the status, purpose, value or understanding points between these individuals or groups (Stoner, 1978).

Looking at the research data within the framework of conflict action styles, it is understood that conflict resolution style is an important factor that directs the behaviours of educators (Yılmaz & Aslan, 2013). At this point, the general framework of conflict resolution can be expressed as the process of behaviours and attitudes exhibited by the parties to finalize the existing conflict, and to provide solutions and agreements for the problems (Balat & Dağal, 2011).

The way chosen and the attitudes exhibited in the resolution of conflicts affect the solution in various ways. For this reason, conflict action styles are one of the determining factors in conflict resolution. In this sense, in this study, the relationship between the perceptions of conflict action styles and organizational commitment perceptions is discussed and how this situation is revealed.

In this respect, "Organizational commitment" is necessary both for the continuity of the organization itself and for the harmony, satisfaction, and productivity of the employees. Employees who continue their lives with high feelings of satisfaction are expected to have positive work attitudes and be more useful. Commitment, in terms of emotion at the highest level; is an individual's loyalty to others or an idea, to something greater than himself/herself, to a duty that he/she is obliged to perform in an organization or workplace (Mahmutoğlu, 2007).

In another approach, commitment can be expressed in the simplest way as an affective inclination towards a certain entity and identification with the social unit. At the same time, there are also expressions of organizational commitment based on moral obligation or responsibility in various studies. In terms of responsibility, commitment is expressed as the totality of internalized normative pressures that occur in a way that satisfies organizational goals and interests (Wiener, 1982).

In this case, acts of commitment are socially accepted behaviours that exceed formal or normative expectations of commitment. Thus, a committed employee is an individual who finds it morally right to stay with the organization, regardless of how much promotion or satisfaction the firm has offered him/her over the years (Sürgevil, 2007). In this framework, organizational commitment is an individual's behaviour towards these goals and values beyond the formal and normative expectations that an organization expects from an individual. Organizational commitment does not mean being loyal to a single employer, it is a process in which those who have joined the organization express their opinions and make efforts for the good of the organization and the continuation of its success (Yüksel, 2000).

Especially the fact that the people who make up the organization have values such as gender differences, age differences, cultural differences or educational differences is a situation encountered in every organization. Incompatibility situations that may arise from these differences may arise in the form of conflict. The term conflict, which also occurs in daily life and is constantly used, generally exhibits negative feelings and thoughts such as disagreement, incompatibility, distress, stress, hostility,

and anxiety. The ability of the organization to achieve its goal, and the commitment of the people who make up the organization is a situation that affects the performance of the organization according to the working situation. It is known that the more the individual's commitment to the organization increases, the more his/her performance in the organization increases.

Determining whether the conflict management strategies experienced in the organization can affect the commitment of people to the organization is important for contributing to the field in terms of academic, practice and field research by shedding light on the situations that may arise in achieving the goals of the organization.

At this point, when a conflict situation occurs, if the individual attaches importance to the relationship with the other person, he/she exhibits relationship-oriented behaviours and in this direction, he/she prefers accommodating approaches towards harmony (Weiten, Hammer, & Dunn, 2016). In this study, the main problem of the research was determined as "the relationship between conflict action styles and organizational commitment perceptions of academic staff?". In this framework, answers to some questions were sought.

The aim of this study is to determine whether the conflict management strategies used by the academic staff working in vocational schools of Aydın Adnan Menderes University in the 2018-2019 academic year influence organizational commitment and whether they differ according to independent variables.

In line with this purpose, do the conflict management strategies used by the academic staff working in vocational schools influence organizational commitment? Within the framework of this problem, answers to questions such as whether conflict action styles and organizational commitment levels differ according to the socio-demographic characteristics of the academic staff, whether there is a relationship between conflict action styles and organizational commitment, whether the conflict action style of the academic staff has an effect on organizational commitment, whether the perceptions of the conflict action styles of the academic staff have an effect on affective commitment, and whether the perceptions of the conflict action styles of the academic staff have an effect on normative commitment were sought:

1. Do Conflict Action Styles and Organizational Commitment levels differ according to the socio-demographic characteristics of academic staff?
2. Is there a relationship between Conflict Action Styles and Organizational Commitment?
3. Does the conflict action style of academic staff influence organizational commitment?

Method

In the model of the research, the research subject, which was determined to investigate the effect of conflict management strategies preferred by the academic staff working in vocational schools on organizational commitment, was examined using the relational screening model, one of the research methods. A relational screening model is a screening approach that aims to determine the existence of co-variation between two or more variables. In the relational screening model, it is tried to

determine whether the variables change together or not, and if there is a change, how it happens (Karasar, 2014).

Population and Sample

The accessible population of the study consists of academic staff working in Vocational Schools of Aydın Adnan Menderes University. Statistical information showing the number of academic staff working in the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 academic years was taken from Aydın Adnan Menderes University's website. There are a total of 106 academic staff working in 19 Vocational Schools of Aydın Adnan Menderes University. The research was conducted without sampling (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013).

Data Collection Tools

In this study, questionnaire forms were used as a data collection method. Furthermore, an information form was used. In addition to these, data were obtained with the scales.

Information Form

It includes demographic information such as gender, age, and term of office of the academic staff working in vocational schools.

Conflict Action Styles Inventory

The Conflict Action Styles Inventory was developed by Johnson and Johnson in 1981 and has been revised and finalized until 2008. The Conflict Action Styles Inventory, which was analysed for validity and reliability by Karadağ and Tosun (2014), was developed to determine individuals' actions during the conflict. The scale is a five-point Likert scale ("1 = I Never Behave Like This", "2 = I Rarely Behave Like This", "3 = I Sometimes Behave Like This", "4 = I Often Behave Like This", "5 = I Mostly Behave Like This") and consists of 35 items and 5 sub-scales, which are avoiding (items 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26 and 31), competing (items 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27 and 32), compromising (items 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28 and 33), accommodating (items 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29 and 34) and collaborating (items 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30 and 35). In addition, there are no statements that require reverse scoring.

Organizational Commitment Scale

Organizational Commitment Scale was developed by Meyer and Allen (1984-1997) and adapted into Turkish by Wasti (2000). The scale is a five-point Likert scale ("5 = Strongly Agree", "4 = Agree", "3 = Partially Agree", "2 = Disagree", "1 = Strongly Disagree") and consists of 18 items and 3 sub-scales, which are affective commitment (items 1, 4, 5, 12, 15 and 16), continuance commitment (items 2, 6,

7, 8, 14 and 18) and normative commitment (items 3, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 17). In addition, the answers to the items numbered 3, 8, 11 and 14 were reverse scored.

When the reliability coefficients of the Conflict Action Styles Inventory and the Organizational Commitment Scale were examined, they were found to be 0.814 and 0.617, respectively. These values reveal that the scales are highly reliable" and it was concluded that there was no obstacle to use them in the analysis (Özdamar, 1999). Permission for the use of the scales was obtained via e-mail.

Data Analysis

All statistical analyses were performed with IBM SPSS 25.0 program. Descriptive statistics were expressed as frequency (f), percentage (%), mean (\bar{X}), standard deviation (SD), minimum and maximum values. In the study, firstly, whether the scales fit the normal distribution hypothesis was determined by skewness and kurtosis coefficients and parametric test methods were preferred. Then, an internal consistency analyses were conducted for the Conflict Action Styles Inventory and Organizational Commitment Scale, and it was discussed whether there was a drawback in using these scales in the study. Then, the personal information of the academic staff working in vocational schools was evaluated. While "independent sample t-test" was used for two-group comparisons of variables that meet the assumption of normal distribution, "one-way ANOVA" was used for comparisons of three or more groups. Finally, the relationship between conflict action styles and organizational commitment was examined with "The Pearson Correlation test" and the effect of conflict action styles on organizational commitment of academic staff working in vocational schools was examined with linear regression analysis, while the effect of conflict action styles perceptions on affective, continuance and normative commitment was examined with multiple linear regression analysis. Statistical significance was evaluated at $p < 0.05$ level in all the results obtained.

Findings

The data of the study were obtained by applying the statements in the Conflict Action Styles Inventory and Organizational Commitment Scale to the academic staff together with demographic questions and the analysis of the data was carried out under this title. In the analyses conducted in this section; "internal consistency analysis, the demographic profile of the academic staff included in the research, descriptive analysis for variables, difference tests, the relationship between conflict action styles and organizational commitment and regression analysis" are included.

Economic and Demographic Profile of Academic staff

In this part of the study, the distribution of gender, age, marital status, education, academic title and term of office in the institution were analysed by frequency analysis. The gender distribution of the academic staff is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of demographic characteristics of academic staffs

Gender	Female	Male			
Status	46 (43.4)	60 (56.6)			
Age	18-25 Age Range	26-30 Age Range	31-40 Age Range	41-50 Age Range	51 Years and Over
	2 (1.9)	6 (5.7)	57 (53.8)	28 (62.4)	13 (12.2)
Marital Status	Single	Married			
	21 (19.8)	85 (80.2)			
Education Status	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	PhD		
	8 (7.5)	66 (62.3)	32 (30.2)		
Academic Title	Lecturer	Assistant Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.	
	89 (84.0)	12 (11.3)	4 (3.8)	1 (.9)	
Term of Office	0-5 Year Range	6-10 Year Range	11-15 Year Range	16-20 Year Range	21 Years and Over
	37 (34.9)	27 (25.5)	19 (17.9)	10 (9.4)	13 (12.2)

According to the results of the frequency analysis in Table 1, 56.6% of the academic staff are male, 43.4% are female, 53.8% are between 31-40 years old and 26.4% are between 41-50 years old. It was also determined that 80.2% of the academic staff are married and 19.8% are single. While 7.5% of the academic staff have a bachelor's degree, 62.3% of them have a master's degree, 30.2% have a PhD degree and 84.0% of them are lecturers. Finally, it is seen that 34.9% of the academic staff have been working between 0-5 years, 25.5% between 6-10 years and 39.5% for 11 years and more.

Difference Tests

In this part of the study, the differences between the gender, age, marital status, education, academic title and term of office in the institution and the levels of the research variables were discussed. Moreover, to obtain more meaningful and accurate results and groups with less than 30 respondents:

- The categorical variables 18-25 years and 26-30 years were combined with the categorical variable 31-40 years as 40 years and below, and the categorical variables 41-50 years and 51 years and above were combined as 41 years and above,
- The categorical variable bachelor's degree was combined with the categorical variable master's degree as bachelor's degree/master's degree,
- The categorical variables Assistant Prof., Assoc. Prof. and Prof. were combined as Assistant Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.,
- The categorical variable 6-10 years was combined with the categorical variable 0-5 years and renamed as 10 years and less and the categorical variables 11-15 years, 16-20 years, and 21 years or more were combined and renamed as 11 years and more.

Table 2: Differentiation of mean scores obtained from variables according to gender

Variables	Gender	n	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p																																																																																								
Conflict Action Styles	Female	46	116,63	13,56	104	,991	,324																																																																																								
	Male	60	114,05	13,08				Avoiding	Female	46	19,70	3,43	104	1,904	,060	Male	60	18,22	4,33	Competing	Female	46	21,65	2,82	104	-1,299	,197	Male	60	22,43	3,24	Compromising	Female	46	24,48	3,91	104	-,082	,935	Male	60	24,53	3,04	Accommodating	Female	46	24,37	3,05	104	1,593	,114	Male	60	23,27	3,86	Collaborating	Female	46	26,43	3,36	104	1,350	,180	Male	60	25,60	2,99	Organizational Commitment	Female	46	55,41	8,23	104	,603	,548	Male	60	54,52	7,06	Affective Commitment	Female	46	17,83	3,06	104	-,451	,653	Male	60	18,08	2,78		Female	46	18,85
Avoiding	Female	46	19,70	3,43	104	1,904	,060																																																																																								
	Male	60	18,22	4,33				Competing	Female	46	21,65	2,82	104	-1,299	,197	Male	60	22,43	3,24	Compromising	Female	46	24,48	3,91	104	-,082	,935	Male	60	24,53	3,04	Accommodating	Female	46	24,37	3,05	104	1,593	,114	Male	60	23,27	3,86	Collaborating	Female	46	26,43	3,36	104	1,350	,180	Male	60	25,60	2,99	Organizational Commitment	Female	46	55,41	8,23	104	,603	,548	Male	60	54,52	7,06	Affective Commitment	Female	46	17,83	3,06	104	-,451	,653	Male	60	18,08	2,78		Female	46	18,85	3,36	104	1,171	,244								
Competing	Female	46	21,65	2,82	104	-1,299	,197																																																																																								
	Male	60	22,43	3,24				Compromising	Female	46	24,48	3,91	104	-,082	,935	Male	60	24,53	3,04	Accommodating	Female	46	24,37	3,05	104	1,593	,114	Male	60	23,27	3,86	Collaborating	Female	46	26,43	3,36	104	1,350	,180	Male	60	25,60	2,99	Organizational Commitment	Female	46	55,41	8,23	104	,603	,548	Male	60	54,52	7,06	Affective Commitment	Female	46	17,83	3,06	104	-,451	,653	Male	60	18,08	2,78		Female	46	18,85	3,36	104	1,171	,244																				
Compromising	Female	46	24,48	3,91	104	-,082	,935																																																																																								
	Male	60	24,53	3,04				Accommodating	Female	46	24,37	3,05	104	1,593	,114	Male	60	23,27	3,86	Collaborating	Female	46	26,43	3,36	104	1,350	,180	Male	60	25,60	2,99	Organizational Commitment	Female	46	55,41	8,23	104	,603	,548	Male	60	54,52	7,06	Affective Commitment	Female	46	17,83	3,06	104	-,451	,653	Male	60	18,08	2,78		Female	46	18,85	3,36	104	1,171	,244																																
Accommodating	Female	46	24,37	3,05	104	1,593	,114																																																																																								
	Male	60	23,27	3,86				Collaborating	Female	46	26,43	3,36	104	1,350	,180	Male	60	25,60	2,99	Organizational Commitment	Female	46	55,41	8,23	104	,603	,548	Male	60	54,52	7,06	Affective Commitment	Female	46	17,83	3,06	104	-,451	,653	Male	60	18,08	2,78		Female	46	18,85	3,36	104	1,171	,244																																												
Collaborating	Female	46	26,43	3,36	104	1,350	,180																																																																																								
	Male	60	25,60	2,99				Organizational Commitment	Female	46	55,41	8,23	104	,603	,548	Male	60	54,52	7,06	Affective Commitment	Female	46	17,83	3,06	104	-,451	,653	Male	60	18,08	2,78		Female	46	18,85	3,36	104	1,171	,244																																																								
Organizational Commitment	Female	46	55,41	8,23	104	,603	,548																																																																																								
	Male	60	54,52	7,06				Affective Commitment	Female	46	17,83	3,06	104	-,451	,653	Male	60	18,08	2,78		Female	46	18,85	3,36	104	1,171	,244																																																																				
Affective Commitment	Female	46	17,83	3,06	104	-,451	,653																																																																																								
	Male	60	18,08	2,78					Female	46	18,85	3,36	104	1,171	,244																																																																																
	Female	46	18,85	3,36	104	1,171	,244																																																																																								

Continuance Commitment	Male	60	18,15	2,77	104	,736	,463
	Female	46	18,74	3,28			
Normative Commitment	Male	60	18,28	3,07			

The results of the independent sample t-test are shown in Table 2, as a result of the analysis; according to the gender of the academic staff, there is statistical significance in conflict action styles ($t=0.991$, $p>0.05$), avoiding ($t=1.904$, $p>0.05$), competing ($t=-1.299$, $p>0.05$), compromising ($t=-0.082$, $p>0.05$), accommodating ($t=1.593$, $p>0.05$), collaborating ($t=1.350$, $p>0.05$), and organizational ($t=0.603$, $p>0.05$), affective ($t=-0.451$, $p>0.05$), continuance ($t=1.171$, $p>0.05$) and normative commitment ($t=0.736$, $p>0.05$). Furthermore, being male or female does not make a difference between the group mean scores of conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, affective, continuance and normative commitment.

Table 3: Differentiation of mean scores obtained from variables according to the age

Variables	Age	n	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p
Conflict Action Styles	40 Years and Under	65	113,15	14,06	104	-1,994	,049*
	41 Years and Over	41	118,37	11,41			
Avoiding	40 Years and Under	65	18,55	4,41	104	-,984	,327
	41 Years and Over	41	19,34	3,29			
Competing	40 Years and Under	65	21,89	2,81	104	-,850	,397
	41 Years and Over	41	22,41	3,48			
Compromising	40 Years and Under	65	23,95	3,66	104	-2,136	,035*
	41 Years and Over	41	25,39	2,84			
Accommodating	40 Years and Under	65	23,37	4,01	104	-1,375	,172
	41 Years and Over	41	24,34	2,63			

Collaborating	40 Years and Under	65	25,38	3,38	104	-2,418	,017*
	41 Years and Over	41	26,88	2,58			
Organizational Commitment	40 Years and Under	65	54,86	7,58	104	-,075	,940
	41 Years and Over	41	54,98	7,64			
Affective Commitment	40 Years and Under	65	17,82	2,69	104	-,698	,487
	41 Years and Over	41	18,22	3,21			
Continuance Commitment	40 Years and Under	65	18,77	3,09	104	1,352	,179
	41 Years and Over	41	17,95	2,95			
Normative Commitment	40 Years and Under	65	18,28	3,28	104	-,838	,404
	41 Years and Over	41	18,80	2,96			

*p<0.05

The results of the independent sample t-test are shown in Table 3, as a result of the analysis; the levels of conflict action styles ($t=-1.994$, $p<0.05$), compromising ($t=-2.136$, $p<0.05$) and collaborating ($t=-2.418$, $p<0.05$) differ statistically and significantly according to the age of the academic staff and the conflict action styles, compromising and collaborating levels of academic staff aged 41 and over are higher than those of academic staff aged 40 and under. However, according to the age of the academic staff, the levels of avoiding ($t=-0.984$, $p>0.05$), competing ($t=-0.850$, $p>0.05$), accommodating ($t=-1.375$, $p>0.05$) and organizational ($t=-0.075$, $p>0.05$), affective ($t=-0.698$, $p>0.05$), continuance ($t=-1.352$, $p>0.05$) and normative commitment ($t=-0.838$, $p>0.05$) levels do not differ statistically and significantly. Besides, the age of the academic staff being 40 years and below or 41 years and above makes a difference between the group mean scores of conflict action styles, compromising and collaborating, but not between the group mean scores of avoiding, competing, accommodating and organizational, affective, continuance and normative commitment.

Table 4: Differentiation of the mean scores obtained from the variables according to the marital status

Variables	Marital Status	n	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p
	Single	21	118,67	13,30	104	1,352	,179

Conflict Action Styles	Married	85	114,31	13,22			
	Single	21	19,95	4,14			
Avoiding	Married	85	18,59	3,96	104	1,401	,164
	Single	21	22,71	1,74			
Competing	Married	85	21,94	3,32	104	1,031	,305
	Single	21	23,90	3,55			
Compromising	Married	85	24,66	3,40	104	-,902	,369
	Single	21	24,86	3,02			
Accommodating	Married	85	23,47	3,64	104	1,611	,110
	Single	21	27,24	3,60			
Collaborating	Married	85	25,65	2,99	104	2,094	,039*
	Single	21	53,52	7,28			
Organizational Commitment	Married	85	55,25	7,64	104	-,934	,352
	Single	21	17,86	3,37			
Affective Commitment	Married	85	18,00	2,79	104	-,201	,841
	Single	21	18,81	3,27			
Continuance Commitment	Married	85	18,36	3,00	104	,597	,552
	Single	21	16,86	2,63			
Normative Commitment	Married	85	18,88	3,16	104	-2,714	,008*
	Single	21					

*p<0.05

The results of the independent sample t-test are shown in Table 4, as a result of the analysis; according to the marital status of the academic staff, the levels of collaborating ($t=2.094$, $p<0.05$) and normative commitment ($t=-2.714$, $p<0.05$) differ statistically and significantly and the level of collaborating of single academic staff is higher than married academic staff, while the level of normative commitment of married academic staff is higher than single academic staff. However, according to the marital status of the academic staff, conflict action styles ($t=1.352$, $p>0.05$), avoiding ($t=1.401$, $p>0.05$), competing ($t=1.031$, $p>0.05$), compromising ($t=-0.902$, $p>0.05$), accommodating ($t=1.611$, $p>0.05$) and organizational ($t=-0.934$, $p>0.05$), affective ($t=-0.201$, $p>0.05$) and continuance commitment ($t=0.597$, $p>0.05$) levels do not differ statistically and significantly. In addition, the single or married status of the

academic staff makes a difference between the group mean scores of collaborating and normative commitments, while conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating and organizational, affective and continuance commitment do not make a difference between the group mean scores.

Table 5: Differentiation of the mean scores obtained from the variables according to the education

Variables	Education	n	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p																																																																																
Conflict Action Styles	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	115,64	12,90	104	,546	,586																																																																																
	PhD	32	114,09	14,30				Avoiding	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	19,05	3,97	104	,761	,448	PhD	32	18,41	4,14	Competing	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	22,15	3,28	104	,275	,784	PhD	32	21,97	2,60	Compromising	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	24,18	3,65	104	-1,534	,128	PhD	32	25,28	2,76	Accommodating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	24,15	2,95	104	1,793	,076	PhD	32	22,81	4,60	Collaborating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	26,11	2,95	104	,719	,474	PhD	32	25,63	3,65	Organizational Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	55,77	7,58	104	1,808	,073	PhD	32	52,91	7,27	Affective Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	18,08	2,94	104	,589	,557
Avoiding	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	19,05	3,97	104	,761	,448																																																																																
	PhD	32	18,41	4,14				Competing	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	22,15	3,28	104	,275	,784	PhD	32	21,97	2,60	Compromising	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	24,18	3,65	104	-1,534	,128	PhD	32	25,28	2,76	Accommodating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	24,15	2,95	104	1,793	,076	PhD	32	22,81	4,60	Collaborating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	26,11	2,95	104	,719	,474	PhD	32	25,63	3,65	Organizational Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	55,77	7,58	104	1,808	,073	PhD	32	52,91	7,27	Affective Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	18,08	2,94	104	,589	,557	PhD	32	17,72	2,83								
Competing	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	22,15	3,28	104	,275	,784																																																																																
	PhD	32	21,97	2,60				Compromising	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	24,18	3,65	104	-1,534	,128	PhD	32	25,28	2,76	Accommodating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	24,15	2,95	104	1,793	,076	PhD	32	22,81	4,60	Collaborating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	26,11	2,95	104	,719	,474	PhD	32	25,63	3,65	Organizational Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	55,77	7,58	104	1,808	,073	PhD	32	52,91	7,27	Affective Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	18,08	2,94	104	,589	,557	PhD	32	17,72	2,83																				
Compromising	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	24,18	3,65	104	-1,534	,128																																																																																
	PhD	32	25,28	2,76				Accommodating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	24,15	2,95	104	1,793	,076	PhD	32	22,81	4,60	Collaborating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	26,11	2,95	104	,719	,474	PhD	32	25,63	3,65	Organizational Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	55,77	7,58	104	1,808	,073	PhD	32	52,91	7,27	Affective Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	18,08	2,94	104	,589	,557	PhD	32	17,72	2,83																																
Accommodating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	24,15	2,95	104	1,793	,076																																																																																
	PhD	32	22,81	4,60				Collaborating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	26,11	2,95	104	,719	,474	PhD	32	25,63	3,65	Organizational Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	55,77	7,58	104	1,808	,073	PhD	32	52,91	7,27	Affective Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	18,08	2,94	104	,589	,557	PhD	32	17,72	2,83																																												
Collaborating	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	26,11	2,95	104	,719	,474																																																																																
	PhD	32	25,63	3,65				Organizational Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	55,77	7,58	104	1,808	,073	PhD	32	52,91	7,27	Affective Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	18,08	2,94	104	,589	,557	PhD	32	17,72	2,83																																																								
Organizational Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	55,77	7,58	104	1,808	,073																																																																																
	PhD	32	52,91	7,27				Affective Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	18,08	2,94	104	,589	,557	PhD	32	17,72	2,83																																																																				
Affective Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	18,08	2,94	104	,589	,557																																																																																
	PhD	32	17,72	2,83																																																																																			

Continuance Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	18,81	3,05	104	1,861	,066
	PhD	32	17,63	2,92			
Normative Commitment	Bachelor's/Master's Degree	74	18,88	3,22	104	2,000	,048*
	PhD	32	17,56	2,83			

*p<0.05

The results of the independent sample t-test are shown in Table 5, because of the analysis; the normative commitment levels of the academic staff differ statistically and significantly according to their education ($t=2.000$, $p<0.05$). The normative commitment level of the academic staff with bachelor's/master's degree is higher than that of the academic staff with PhD degree. However, according to the education of the academic staff, conflict action styles ($t=0.546$, $p>0.05$), avoiding ($t=0.761$, $p>0.05$), competing ($t=0.275$, $p>0.05$), compromising ($t=-1.534$, $p>0.05$), accommodating ($t=1.793$, $p>0.05$), collaborating ($t=0.719$, $p>0.05$) and organizational ($t=1.808$, $p>0.05$), affective ($t=0.589$, $p>0.05$) and continuance commitment ($t=1.861$, $p>0.05$) levels do not differ statistically and significantly. Furthermore, while having a bachelor's/master's degree or PhD makes a difference between normative commitment group mean scores, conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, affective and continuance commitment group mean scores do not make a difference.

Table 6: Differentiation of mean scores obtained from variables according to academic title

Variables	Academic Title	n	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p
Conflict Action Styles	Lecturer	89	116,52	12,56			
	Assistant. Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.	17	108,12	15,09	104	2,444	,016*
Avoiding	Lecturer	89	19,27	3,88			
	Assistant. Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.	17	16,71	4,15	104	2,472	,015*
Competing	Lecturer	89	22,31	3,11			
	Assistant. Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.	17	20,94	2,73	104	1,701	,092
Compromising	Lecturer	89	24,48	3,61	104	-,180	,858

	Assistant. Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.	17	24,65	2,37			
	Lecturer	89	24,20	2,99			
Accommodating	Assistant. Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.	17	21,35	5,18	104	3,150	,002*
	Lecturer	89	26,25	2,97			
Collaborating	Assistant. Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.	17	24,47	3,83	104	2,155	,033*
	Lecturer	89	55,79	7,39			
Organizational Commitment	Assistant. Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.	17	50,29	6,97	104	2,833	,006*
	Lecturer	89	18,12	2,82			
Affective Commitment	Assistant. Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.	17	17,18	3,24	104	1,239	,218
	Lecturer	89	18,79	3,05			
Continuance Commitment	Assistant. Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.	17	16,71	2,39	104	2,654	,009*
	Lecturer	89	18,88	3,03			
Normative Commitment	Assistant. Prof. / Assoc. Prof. / Prof.	17	16,41	3,04	104	3,068	,003*

*p<0.05

The results of the independent sample t-test are shown in Table 6, as a result of the analysis; according to the academic title, conflict action styles ($t=2.444$, $p<0.05$), avoiding ($t=2.472$, $p<0.05$), accommodating ($t=3.150$, $p<0.05$), collaborating ($t=2.155$, $p<0.05$) and organizational ($t=2.833$, $p<0.05$), continuance ($t=2.654$, $p<0.05$) and normative commitment ($t=3.068$, $p<0.05$) levels differ statistically and significantly and the conflict action styles, avoiding, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, continuance and normative commitment levels of the academic staff who is lecturer are higher than the academic staff who is Assistant Prof./ Assoc. Prof./ Prof. However, the levels of competing ($t=1.701$, $p>0.05$), compromising ($t=-0.180$, $p>0.05$) and affective commitment ($t=1.239$, $p>0.05$) do not differ statistically and significantly according to the academic title. In addition, the title groups of the academic staff make a difference between the group mean scores of conflict action styles, avoiding, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, continuance and normative commitment, but not between the group mean scores of competing, compromising and affective commitment.

Table 7: Differentiation of the mean scores obtained from the variables according to the term of office

Variables	Term of Office	n	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p
Conflict Action Styles	10 Years and Less	64	113,84	14,41	104	-1,272	,206
	11 Years and Over	42	117,19	11,23			
Avoiding	10 Years and Less	64	18,81	4,11	104	-,145	,885
	11 Years and Over	42	18,93	3,91			
Competing	10 Years and Less	64	21,81	2,83	104	-1,166	,246
	11 Years and Over	42	22,52	3,41			
Compromising	10 Years and Less	64	24,05	3,70	104	-1,731	,086
	11 Years and Over	42	25,21	2,87			
Accommodating	10 Years and Less	64	23,47	3,94	104	-,987	,326
	11 Years and Over	42	24,17	2,89			
Collaborating	10 Years and Less	64	25,70	3,53	104	-1,040	,301
	11 Years and Over	42	26,36	2,52			
Organizational Commitment	10 Years and Less	64	54,70	8,19	104	-,339	,735
	11 Years and Over	42	55,21	6,58			
Affective Commitment	10 Years and Less	64	17,56	3,12	104	-1,815	,072
	11 Years and Over	42	18,60	2,43			
Continuance Commitment	10 Years and Less	64	18,75	3,13	104	1,243	,217
	11 Years and Over	42	18,00	2,90			

	10 Years and Less	64	18,39	3,34		
Normative Commitment	11 Years and Over	42	18,62	2,89	104	-,363 ,717

The results of the independent sample t-test are shown in Table 7, as a result of the analysis; according to the term of office of the academic staff in the institution, conflict action styles ($t=-1.272$, $p>0.05$), avoiding ($t=-0.145$, $p>0.05$), competing ($t=-1.166$, $p>0.05$), compromising ($t=-1.731$, $p>0.05$), accommodating ($t=-0.987$, $p>0.05$), collaborating ($t=-1.040$, $p>0.05$) and organizational ($t=-0.339$, $p>0.05$), affective ($t=-1.815$, $p>0.05$), continuance ($t=1.243$, $p>0.05$) and normative commitment ($t=-0.363$, $p>0.05$) levels do not differ statistically and significantly. Furthermore, whether the term of office of the academic staff in the institution is 10 years and less or 11 years and more does not make a difference between the group mean scores of conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, affective, continuance and normative commitment.

Findings on the Relationships between Variables

In this part of the study, the relationship between conflict action styles and organizational commitment was examined with "Pearson Correlation Analysis", one of the parametric test methods, and statistical significance was evaluated at $p<0.05$ level.

Table 8: Pearson correlation analysis results

		Conflict Action Styles	Organizational Commitment
Conflict Action Styles	r_p	1	
	p		
Organizational Commitment	r_p	,321**	1
	p	,001	

** $p<0.01$

When the Pearson Correlation test results in Table 8 are examined, it is observed that there is a positive moderate relationship between the level of conflict action styles and organizational commitment ($r_p=0.321$, $p=0.001$).

Findings for Regression Analysis

In this part of the study, regression analyses were conducted within the scope of the models created in line with the purpose of the study and the findings of the linear regression analysis investigating the effect of conflict action styles on organizational commitment are presented in Table 9. "Before the regression analyses, normality, linearity and homogeneity assumptions for the scale structures were examined. Since there were no extreme outliers in the scale structures and the Durbin-Watson statistic was 1.879, it was concluded that there was no autocorrelation among the errors" (Genceli, 1973). Besides, the "multiple linear connection problem" VIF values were examined, and it was determined that there was no multiple linear connection problem since VIF values were less than 10 ($VIF < 10$) (Albayrak, 2005).

Table 9: The effect of conflict action styles on organizational commitment

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients			F	R ²
	B	Std. error	β	t	p		
Fixed	33,865	6,130		5,524	,000		
Conflict Action Styles (X_{CAS})	,183	,053	,321	3,455	,001	11,937*	,103

Dependent variable: Organizational Commitment (Y_{OC})

* $p < 0.001$

According to the results of the linear regression analysis performed to determine to what extent conflict action styles are effective on organizational commitment, it is understood that this model is statistically significant and conflict action styles can explain 10.3% of the variance of organizational commitment ($R^2 = .103$; $F(1,104) = 11,937$, $p = 0.001$). According to the results, conflict action styles predict organizational commitment positively, statistically, and significantly ($\beta = 0.321$, $t = 3,455$, $p = 0.001$). In other words, the level of conflict action styles of the academic staff included in the study positively affects their organizational commitment levels. Moreover, when other variables are held constant, a one-unit increase in the level of conflict action styles of the academic staff provides an increase of 0.183 in the level of organizational commitment. The equation of the model is $Y_{OC} = 33,865 + 0,183 X_{CAS}$.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

Very important studies on organizational commitment have been conducted especially in the 1980s. Greenhaus (1971), while discussing the concept at this point, expressed it as giving oneself to his/her profession, job or him/herself, apart from the time spent in the working environment. In this study, it is in line with the results related to commitment.

Özmen, Özer, and Saatçioğlu (2005) examined organizational commitment and professional commitment in academicians and observed that there are two types of commitment for academicians and that the professional commitment of academicians was higher than their organizational commitment due to their knowledge worker characteristics. In addition to these, it is seen that while there is a difference between the conflict action styles, compromising and collaborating group mean scores of the academic staff included in this study, there is no difference between the group mean scores of avoiding, competing, accommodating and organizational, affective, continuance and normative commitment.

In this framework, Boylu et al. (2007), in their study on the organizational commitment levels of academicians, stated that significant differences were observed between the personal characteristics of academicians and their organizational commitment levels. In this study, there is no difference between male and female academic staff in terms of conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, affective, continuance and normative commitment group mean scores.

In Sheldon's (1971) work, commitment was considered as a positive orientation and expressed as an attitude or orientation towards the organization. Such an attitude integrates the identity of the person with the organization and increases the commitment of people who have a sense of social participation and professional competition. In this study, while there is a difference between the title groups, conflict action styles, avoiding, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, continuance and normative commitment group mean scores of the academic staff, they are the same in competing, compromising and affective commitment.

In the study conducted by Sıgır (2006), public and private sector employees were included in their research and as a result, it was understood that the affective commitment of private sector employees was higher. When we look at the results of the study conducted by Tetik (2012) on healthcare employees, it is seen that the affective commitment of the employees to the organization was low, and the level of continuance commitment and normative commitment was at a medium level, while in this study, it is understood that there is no difference between the affective commitment group mean scores of the academic staff.

Boylu et al. (2007) stated that while the expressions with the highest level of agreement regarding the degree of agreement of the academicians with the statements about affective, continuance and normative commitment towards both the unit they work for and the whole university were the statements about affective commitment, it was followed by statements about normative and continuance commitment, respectively. In the present study, it was concluded that there is no difference between the conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, affective, continuance and normative commitment group mean scores of the academic staff included in the study.

As a result of another research, it was observed that personality traits such as extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience positively affect affective commitment and extraversion, conscientiousness and openness to experience personality traits positively affect normative commitment (Bozkaya, 2013). In the study conducted by Gündoğan (2009), it was

determined that the participants had high levels of emotional and continuance commitment and low levels of normative commitment, and significant relationships were found between the emotional commitment sub-dimension and place of work, marital status, age, education level, and length of service. It was found that there was a significant relationship between the normative commitment dimension and only gender, and the duration of service in the title did not have a statistically significant relationship with any commitment dimension. In the present study, it was observed that whether the academic staff is single or married makes a difference between the group mean scores of collaborating and normative commitments, while conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating and organizational, affective and continuance commitment does not make a difference between group mean scores. Besides, while having a bachelor's / master's or PhD makes a difference between group mean scores of normative commitments, conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating, collaborating, and organizational commitment, it was understood that there is no difference between the group mean scores of affective commitment and continuance commitment. Moreover, when the term of office is 10 years and less or 11 years and more, there is no difference between the group mean scores of conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, affective, continuance and normative commitment.

In the research conducted by Bozkurt and Yurt (2013), it was found that academic staff showed commitment to their institutions and this commitment was mainly affective. In another research conducted by Kurtbaş (2011), most of the academicians participating in the research had high levels of affective, continuance and normative commitment respectively, and there was a significant relationship between the organizational commitment levels and the variables of age, title and term of office. In another research conducted by Özkırış (2012), organizational commitment levels did not differ in terms of university, unit, title, gender, marital status, and term of office in the institution, but differed in terms of age groups. Welsch and La Van (1981) determined that organizational commitment is an important measure in evaluating the level of unity between the employee and the organization, while the distribution of gender, age, marital status, education, academic title and term of office in the institution of the academic staff included in this study was examined.

When other results are considered and the differentiation between the gender, age, marital status, education, academic title, and term of office in the institution and the levels of the research variables of the academic staff constituting the research group are examined:

- There is no difference between the group mean scores of conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, affective, continuance and normative commitment,
- When the age of the academic staff is 40 years and below or 41 years and above, there is a difference between conflict action styles, compromising and collaborating group mean scores, but there is no difference between avoiding, competing, accommodating and organizational, affective, continuance and normative commitment group mean scores,
- The single or married status of the academic staff included in the study creates a difference between the group mean scores of collaborating and normative commitments, while conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating and organizational, affective and continuance commitment does not create a difference between the group mean scores,

- The bachelor's / master's or PhD degree of the academic staff included in the study makes a difference between normative commitment group mean scores, however, it does not make a difference between conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, affective and continuance commitment group mean scores,
- The title groups of the academic staff included in the study creates a difference between the group mean scores of conflict action styles, avoiding, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, continuance and normative commitment, but not between the group mean scores of competing, compromising and affective commitment,
- It was determined that whether the term of office of the academic staff included in the study is 10 years and less or 11 years and more does not make a difference between the group mean scores of conflict action styles, avoiding, competing, compromising, accommodating, collaborating and organizational, affective, continuance and normative commitment.

When the results of the regression model created in line with the purpose of the study were examined, it was found that conflict action styles predict organizational commitment positively, statistically, and significantly, and when other variables are held constant, a one-unit increase in the level of conflict action styles of academic staff led to an increase of 0.183 in the level of organizational commitment.

It was determined that perceptions of conflict action styles can explain 12.1% of the variance of affective commitment and make a significant contribution to the avoiding model among conflict action styles, but not to the competing, compromising, accommodating, and collaborating models. It was observed that the perceptions of conflict action styles can explain 13.0% of the variance of normative commitment and contribute significantly to the accommodating model among conflict action styles, but not to the avoiding, competing, compromising, and collaborating models.

It was found that the perceptions of conflict action styles can explain 25.3% of the variance of continuance commitment and make a significant contribution to the avoiding and collaborating models among conflict action styles, but not to the competing, compromising, and accommodating models.

Recommendations

In future studies, it is thought that in the evaluation of conflict action styles of academic staff, working with more different groups in terms of organizational commitment will yield results to provide more detailed information. In this framework, it is understood that providing opportunities for employees to develop themselves and to be promoted in other institutions will lead to positive results.

In this framework, the importance of creating organizational commitment can be emphasized by taking opinions not only from academicians but also from other professions.

It is understood that it is important to know the role of organizational commitment in the development of organizations. Especially considering the contribution of universities, which are educational and scientific organizations, to humanity and society, at this point, the level of commitment can be

increased by considering the wishes and expectations of the employees in the institutions of universities.

In this direction, it is thought that conducting current situation analyses on conflict styles and organizational commitment at various times will make important contributions to the field.

Acknowledgements or Notes

The related study is presented as a master's thesis. Thank you to everyone who participated in the study.

Author (s) Contribution Rate

The first author of the study is a graduate thesis student. The second author is the thesis advisor. Their contribution to the work is equal.

Conflicts of Interest

There is no conflict of interest with any institution or person for the study.

References

- Albayrak, A.S. (2005). Çoklu doğrusal bağlantı halinde en küçük kareler tekniğinin alternatifi yanlı tahmin teknikleri ve bir uygulama. *ZKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 1(1) 106-126.
- Balat, G. U. & Dağal, A. B. (2011). *Okul öncesinde değerler eğitimi etkinlikleri*. Kök Yayınevi.
- Baron, R. A. (1990) *Conflict in organizations*. In K. R. Murphy and F. E. Saal (Eds.), *Psychology in organizations: Integrating science and practice* (pp. 197–216). Erlbaum.
- Boylu Y., Pelit E. & Güçer E. (2007). Akademisyenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Finans Politik & Ekonomik Yorumlar*, 44(511).
- Bozkaya, E. (2013). *Örgüt çalışanlarının kişilik özellikleri ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: hiyerarşik yapısı yüksek bir kurumda uygulama* [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Balıkesir.
- Bozkurt, Ö. & Yurt, İ. (2013). Akademisyenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(22).
- Çırpan, H. (1999). *Örgütsel öğrenme iklimi ve örgüte bağlılık ilişkisi: bir alan araştırması* [Yayımlanmamış doktora Tezi]. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Genceli, M. (1973). İki değişkenli doğrusal regresyonda zaman faktörü. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 33(1), 179.
- Greenhaus, J. H., (1971). An investigation on the role of career salience in vocational behaviour. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1, 209-216.

- Gündoğan, T. (2009). *Örgütsel bağlılık: Türkiye Cumhuriyet Merkez Bankası uygulaması* [Yayımlanmamış uzmanlık yeterlilik tezi]. Türkiye Cumhuriyet Merkez Bankası İnsan Kaynakları Genel Müdürlüğü.
- Karadağ, E. & Tosun, Ü. (2014). Çatışma Eylem Stilleri Ölçeği [ÇESÖ]: Türkçe'ye uyarlanması dil geçerliği ve ön psikometrik incelemesi. *Psikoloji Çalışmaları/Studies in Psychology*, 34(1), 45-69.
- Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Nobel.
- Köklü, N., Büyüköztürk, Ş. & Bökeoğlu, Ö. Ç. (2006). *Sosyal bilimler için istatistik*. PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Kurtbaş, D. (2011). *Akademisyenlerin maruz kaldıkları psikolojik şiddet ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki kamu ve vakıf üniversitelerinde bir araştırma*. [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Mahmutoğlu, A. (2007). *Millî eğitim bakanlığı merkez örgütünde iş doyum ve örgütsel bağlılık*. [Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resources Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications.
- Özdamar, K. (1999) *Paket program ile istatistiksel veri analizi* (2. Baskı). Kaan Kitabevi.
- Özkırış, B. (2012). *Akademisyenlerin temel benlik değerlendirmeleri ile duygusal örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Maltepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. İstanbul.
- Özmen, Ö. T., Özer, P. S. & Saatçioğlu, Ö. Y. (2005). Akademisyenlerde örgütsel ve mesleki bağlılığın incelenmesine ilişkin bir örnek araştırma. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 1-14.
- Sheldon, M. E. (1971). Investments and involvements as mechanisms producing commitment to the organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 143-150.
- Sıgır, Ü. (2007). İş görenlerin örgütsel bağlılıklarının meyer ve ailen tipolojisiyle analizi: kamu ve özel sektörde karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7, 261-278.
- Spaho, K. (2013). Örgütsel iletişim ve çatışma yönetimi. *Yönetim-Çağdaş Yönetim Sorunları Dergisi*, 18(1), 103-118.
- Stoner, J. A. F. (1978). *Management*. Prentice Hall Inc.
- Sürgevil, O. (2007). *Çalışma yaşamında örgütsel bağlılık* [Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Tetik, S. (2012). Sağlık çalışanlarının örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma.

Sosyal ve Beşerî Bilimler Dergisi, 4(1).

- Wasti, S. A. (2000). Meyer ve Allen'in üç boyutlu örgütsel bağlılık ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik analizi. *8. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi.*
- Weiner, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: a normative view, *Academy of Management Review, 7(3)*, 418-428.
- Weiten, W., Hammer, E. Y. & Dunn, D. S. (2016) (Ed.). *Psikoloji ve çağdaş yaşam insan uyumu.* (Çev. Ed. Ebru İkiz). Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Welsch, H.P. & La Van, H. (1981). Interrelationship between organizational commitment, job characteristics, job satisfaction, professional behavior, and organizational climate. *Human Relations, 34*, 1079-1090.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri.* Seçkin.
- Yılmaz, E. E. & Aslan, H. (2013). Öğretmenlerin iş yerindeki yalnızlıkları ve yaşam doyumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Pegem Journal of Education & Instruction / Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim, 3(3)*, 59-69.
- Yüksel, Ö. (2000). *İnsan kaynakları yönetimi.* Gazi Kitabevi.